

Mr. C. A. Weatherby and Mr. Bayard Long have both rendered invaluable assistance in their willingness to aid in the determination of critical material. To them the writer's deepest thanks are due.

He is also indebted to Professor L. H. Bailey, who has kindly examined several specimens of *Rubus*, to Professor K. M. Wiegand, who has looked over some of the *Amelanchier* material, and to Mrs. Agnes Chase who has given her opinion on a few sheets of *Panicum*.

(To be continued)

GENTIANA PROCERA Holm, forma **laevicalyx**, n. f. calycium carinis, glabris.—Locally in Michigan and Indiana. MICHIGAN: shore of Lake Superior, *Whitney*; low wet grounds, Detroit, September 26, 1901, *Farwell*, no. 1447 c. INDIANA: frequent in one place in the sedge border of the north side of Bruce Lake, Fulton County, September 21, 1928, *Deam*, no. 46,341 (TYPE in Gray Herb.).

G. procera Holm, Ott. Nat. xv. 111, 179, t. xii. figs. 3–5 (1901), ordinarily has the keels of the calyx scabrous at least at base. Forma *laevicalyx* appears to be inseparable from it in any character except the quite glabrous calyx; but on account of this character it is likely to be mistaken for the much smaller *G. Victorinii* Fernald, RHODORA, xxv. 87, t. 139 (1923) of the estuary of the St. Lawrence. *G. Victorinii*, however, besides by its much smaller flowers, is distinguished from *G. procera*, forma *laevicalyx* by its shorter and more erect branches and peduncles, much less fringed corolla-lobes and stipitate (instead of essentially sessile) capsule.—M. L. FERNALD, Gray Herbarium.

THE IDENTITY OF ALOPECURUS AEQUALIS.—Following the lead of Schinz & Thellung,¹ progressive botanists have taken up the name *Alopecurus aequalis* Sobol. Fl. Petrop. 16 (1799) in place of the later *A. aristulatus* Michx. Fl. Bor.-Am. i. 43 (1803) or *A. fulvus* Sm. Engl. Bot. xxi. t. 1467 (1805). A discussion of the question was published by me in RHODORA, xxvii. 196 (1925). More recently, however, Jansen & Wachter, in a detailed study of the genus, *Floristische Aanteekeningen XXIV (Alopecurus)*, attempt to show² that the iden-

¹ Schinz & Thellung, Bull. Herb. Boiss. 2me sér. vii. 396 (1907); Viertelj. Naturf. Gesells. Zürich, lxvi. 291 (1921).

² Jansen & Wachter, Nederlandsch Kruidkundig Archief, Jaarg. 1929, Afl. i. 69 (1929).

tity of *A. aequalis* is open to question. Their chief point is that, since species no. 44, *Alopecurus geniculatus*, of Sobolewski was really not an *Alopecurus* at all but *Agrostis stolonifera*, with "corollis muticis," we are not fully justified in inferring that Sobolewski's species no. 45, "ALOPECURUS AEQUALIS. Aristis gluma aequalibus (Sob.)" has been correctly identified. Although Jansen & Wachter feel that the identity of *A. aequalis* is uncertain, they admit that the brief diagnosis given of it, "Aristis gluma aequalibus" is a characteristic mark of the species ("Dit is inderdaad een karakteristiek kenmerk der soort"). Sobolewski misidentified plate 564 in *Flora Danica* as *Alopecurus geniculatus*, whereas it really represents *Agrostis stolonifera* with a tightly contracted panicle. Surely any one else looking casually at the plate, without noting the details, might readily pass it as *Alopecurus*. Its habital resemblance to plate 861, representing *Alopecurus geniculatus*, is striking enough. Consequently, when Sobolewski described a new species as *Alopecurus aequalis*, which differed from his conception (*Fl. Dan.* t. 564) of *A. geniculatus* by having "Aristis gluma aequalibus" and which "In lacubus natans est," he was giving a rather vivid account of the plant subsequently described as *A. aristulatus* Michx. (1803) and as *A. fulvus* Sm. (1805). Unless some more convincing objection is brought forward we shall be justified in continuing the use of the name *A. aequalis* in this sense.—M. L. FERNALD, Gray Herbarium.

Volume 32, no. 381, including pages 167 to 186, was issued 4 September, 1930.